DOCKET NUMBER 125

The Declaration of Francis Lopez attached hereto is in response to the Motion for Terminating Sanctions filed by Mr. Keehn. The Motion is based on the failure of Mr. Lopez to pay sanctions to Mr. Keehn in the amount of \$8,130.50.

This is a case about an alleged Debtor who owns a home with his wife in Florida and virtually nothing else. The Petitioning Creditor has acknowledged that. The Alleged

23

24

25

26

27

28

2.4

Debtor attempted to pay every creditor including Mr. Stanly more than a year ago which motion was opposed by Mr. Stanly. The Court was inundated with the bills and debts of Mr. Lopez at the previous Motion for Summary Judgment re the total number of creditors. The Court knows that there are very few creditors of this estate who are owed small amounts beyond Mr. Stanly.

Mr. Lopez prays that this court deny the motion to strike the Answer and set a trial date. Mr. Keehn, the attorney for the single petitioning creditor, has advised the court on more than one occasion that once the deposition of Mr. Lopez was complete, he would file a Motion for Summary Judgment as to Phase II. Mr. Lopez traveled to San Diego at his own cost without a court order requiring him to do so and appeared for his deposition on October 23, 2007. He answered the questions of Mr. Keehn for more than six hours. The long trail of this case is ready to finish. The Court should not allow it to be short-circuited by striking the Answer.

As to the Sanctions, Mr. Lopez, through counsel, offered on December 17, 2007 to pay \$4,000 of the sanctions immediately and \$1,000 per month for four months thereafter. See **Exhibit "A."** Mr. Keehn responded on December 20, 2007 with a resounding "no." That email communication is not attached because it contained other settlement discussion.

Terminating sanctions is an extreme remedy which should not be assessed except in extraordinary circumstances. Here Mr. Lopez has provided every document in his possession, responded to written discovery more than once, and attended his deposition twice. Nothing has been withheld; the most that has happened is that Mr. Lopez has perhaps been dilatory with some of his responses and in making preparations to attend his second deposition in San Diego. There was one Motion to Compel which was complied with. The Second Motion to Compel resulted in an Order of this court prohibiting Mr. Lopez from introducing any document as evidence that had not already been produced. There was no finding of the court that Mr. Lopez had in any way violated the Order from the first Motion to Compel. Counsel for Lopez agreed to the prohibitory order after explaining to the court that there were simply no further documents that were relevant that

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

could be produced. There is no discovery order that Mr. Lopez has failed to comply with. There was no order to appear for his deposition. Mr. Lopez voluntarily traveled to San Diego for the convenience of Mr. Keehn without a court order.

In Wyle v. R.J Reynolds Inductries, Inc. 709 F.2d 585 (9th Cir. 1983), the court said, "courts have inherent power to dismiss an action when a party has willfully deceived the court and engaged in conduct utterly inconsistent with the orderly administration of justice." There is no deceit on behalf of Mr. Lopez. The Wylie court said, "[B]ecause dismissal is so harsh a penalty, it should be imposed only in extreme circumstances" citing Raiford v. Pounds, 640 F.2d 944,945 (9th Cir. 1981). "Sanctions interfering with a litigant's claim or defenses violate due process when imposed merely for punishment of an infraction that did not threaten to interfere with the rightful decision of the case." Citing G-K Properties v. Redevelopment Agency, 577 F.2d 645, 648 (9th Cir. 1978).

Mr. Keehn has received every document he has requested. He has taken two depositions over two full day periods. He has told the court he will file a Motion for Summary Judgment once the deposition is complete. The deposition is complete. Mr. Keehn has not suggested that Mr. Lopez refused to respond to any question asked or that the delay in flying to California of about five weeks resulted in any prejudice or harm to his ability to go through with his Motion for Summary Judgment.

The Wylie court "determined that the deliberate deception and the irreparable loss of material evidence justified the sanction of dismissal." There has been no deliberate deception and no loss of anything.

In Matter of Visioneering Const., 661 F.2d 119, 123 (9th Cir. 1981), an involuntary petition case, the court struck the Answer. The court said," [The alleged debtor's] near total refusal to facilitate discovery related to the jurisdictional factual issues and continued failure to respect discovery orders were therefore justifiably sanctioned by the entry of default." There has been no "near total refusal." Mr. Lopez has provided hundreds of pages of documents to Mr. Keehn.

28

Wherefore Alleged Debtor Francis Lopez prays that the court deny this motion, allow him to pay the sanctions in payments of \$4,000 immediately and \$1,000 per month and set a date to hear the Motion for Summary Judgment that Stanly has long promised to file.

Dated: January 14, 2008

Respectfully submitted

By:

M. Jonathan Hayes

Atterney for Alleged Debtor Francis

Lopez

LAW OFFICES
M. Jonathan Hayes

Opposition to Motion for Terminating Sanctions

4 5

_ .

DECLARATION OF FRANCIS LOPEZ

I, Francis Lopez, declare and state as follows:

- 1. I am the alleged debtor in this involuntary proceeding. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein, and if called as a witness, I could and would testify competently thereto.
- 2. I did not make the sanctions payment because I was unable to come up with the full amount of the sanctions in Mid-December. I authorized my attorney to offer to pay \$4,000 immediately and \$1,000 per month until paid.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief. Executed on this 14th day of January, 2008 at Destin, Florida.

Bv:

Francis Lopez

M. Jonathan Hayes

From:

"M. Jonathan Hayes" <jhayes@polarisnet.net>

To: Sent: "L. Scott Keehn" <scottk@keehnlaw.com> Wednesday, December 19, 2007 11:05 AM

Subject:

Francis Lopez Sanctions

Mr. Keehn,

My client does not have the \$8,100 in sanction to pay now. He can pay you \$4,000 now and \$1,000 per month until paid. Let me know if that will work.

Thanks, Jon Hayes

M. Jonathan Hayes
jhayes@polarisnet.net
21800 Oxnard St. Suite 840
Woodland Hills, CA 91367
(818) 710-3656
(818) 710-3659 fax
(818) 402-7537 cell

www.lawprofessorblogs.com

If you have received this message in error, please call (818) 710-3656 and notify me of that fact and destroy all copies of this message."

Thank you.

Executed on January 15, 2008, at Los Angeles, California.

MJ Hayes

LAW OFFICES
M. Jonathan Haves

25

26

27

28

Opposition to Motion for Terminating Sanctions